



WMO

# INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE



UNEP

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL  
ON CLIMATE CHANGE

TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION  
Budapest, 9-10 April 2008

IPCC-XXVIII/INF.1, Add.1  
(6.IV.2008)

Agenda item: 4  
ENGLISH ONLY

## **FUTURE OF THE IPCC**

**Comments received after the deadline and translations into English of earlier submissions**

(Submitted by the Secretariat)

## Late Comments received after 20<sup>th</sup> February 2008

### **Canada – Assistant Deputy Minister Science and Technology Branch**

In response to your letter dated January 4<sup>th</sup> inviting comments on the future of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), I am pleased to present the Government of Canada's views on the future of the IPCC.

My apologies for missing your deadline on this issue, however, it did take some time after receiving your discussion paper to solicit the input of Canadian scientists and policymakers.

The Government of Canada would like the IPCC to remain focused on its mandate "to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis the latest scientific, technical and socio-economic literature produced worldwide relevant to the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change, its observed and projected impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation". Canada believes the core strength of the IPCC is its robust and rigorous science assessment process and products. Thus, in terms of the future of the IPCC, Canada supports the continuation of comprehensive science assessments every 5-6 years. This means that the IPCC should be cautious about undertaking a large number of special reports and should establish clear criteria to guide decision making when special reports are proposed. Such proposals should be subject to strong filters to ensure they are fully compatible with the IPCC mandate, complement its full assessment reports, and do not exceed the capacity of the scientific community to serve the IPCC by volunteering their time and expertise. Canada would like to see the IPCC continue with the current three working groups and Task Force on Inventories, albeit with some changes to the working group responsibilities.

Canada believes that some of the concerns raised by IPCC scientists and governments with respect to the Fourth Assessment can be remedied within the scoping process for the Fifth Assessment Report. During the scoping phase, we will stress the need to keep the advance scoping of the report to be sufficiently flexible to allow Working Group co-chairs and coordinating lead authors the ability to ensure that the reports reflect the best science available and not be unduly constrained. We agree that additional emphasis on both economics and adaptation are desirable for the next assessment.

Canada supports your recommendation that the Bureau structure be slightly re-organized to have two Vice-Chairs with specific tasks and responsibilities. Canada would like to see one of the Vice-Chairs have the responsibility for improving emphasis on economic aspects of climate change within Working Groups II and III. This would assist in rectifying the deficiencies of this aspect of climate change in the Third and Fourth Assessments. Canada looks forward to the next Plenary and the opportunity for a substantive sharing of views about the possible means to improve the treatment of economic issues in the Fifth Assessment Report, and the results of this discussion should inform the planning and scoping for the AR5. In particular, we recognize that the scope and structure determined by the governments during the scoping for the Third and Fourth Assessment has resulted in a focus for Working Group III on mitigation options and costs by sector and mitigation policies. This scope excludes the work of most of the most eminent economists and, as a result, they do not participate and the stature of IPCC is thereby reduced. Thus, we propose to include a wider range of economic and policy experts in the scoping stage of the report.

Canada would like to explore options for including a wider range of experts in the AR5. For instance, we would like to see economic and policy experts from non-academic settings (i.e. government experts) as contributors to the Working Group III contribution to the Fifth Assessment. We also think that the Working Group II report would be strengthened by the inclusion of a broad range of practitioners responsible for the implementation of adaptation policies.

Canada would also like to see the issue of adaptation to climate variability and change be further emphasized in the next IPCC assessment. This can be aided by a slight shift in focus for the Working Groups whereby the discussion of observed impacts on natural systems could be shifted from the Working Group II report to the Working Group I report. It should be recognized that the strength and rigor of the Working Group I report continues to be of key importance to the IPCC, and that the IPCC's efforts in this area should not be diminished. However, adding responsibility for the assessment of literature on observed impacts to natural systems to Working Group I should help to strengthen that aspect of the report and will allow better integration between global and regional assessments of observed climate changes and impacts.

Canada also believes that sustainable development should not be a stand-alone report, as suggested. Rather, the aspects of this issue that are strongly related to climate change should be better integrated into the work of Working Groups II and III at the scoping stage.

I took forward to the discussions on the future of the IPCC in Budapest and working towards strengthening the IPCC while keeping the organization focused on its core strength: science assessment.

---

## Colombia - Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores (translation into English below)

1. Colombia considera necesario el fortalecimiento del PCC con relación a los impactos locales y regionales del cambio climático, especialmente en aquellas regiones donde no existen investigaciones sobre dichos impactos. Por lo tanto, apoyamos la propuesta de que el IPCC actúe como facilitador en la realización de un taller de expertos, del cual podría surgir un eventual programa de acción para fortalecer la investigación del cambio climático a nivel regional y local.

2. Colombia apoya la realización de un Quinto Informe de Evaluación (AR5) del Panel Intergubernamental, considerando los siguientes parámetros propuestos dentro del documento:

- La elaboración de **Reportes Especiales** con una periodicidad apropiada para la consecución de la información (de acuerdo al documento se sugiere que sea cada 3 años).

- Con respecto a la elaboración de una evaluación completa, como se sugiere únicamente cada dos ciclos (cada 10 o 12 años), sería un tiempo demasiado largo para tomar acciones específicas en los distintos temas. Por lo anterior sería importante apoyar la propuesta del Presidente del IPCC, con respecto a realizar una evaluación completa en el mismo término con el que se ha venido elaborando (cada 5 o 6 años) pero realizando reportes especiales en un término de 3 años, de acuerdo con el mandato de la Junta.

- Así mismo, Colombia considera que sería de particular importancia realizar un reporte comprehensivo para el año 2012, como apoyo a las negociaciones del período de cumplimiento posterior a 2012 del Protocolo de Kioto. Este reporte deberá ser planeado de tal manera, que los temas de la actual agenda internacional de negociación sean tratados de manera específica.

- Apoyamos la propuesta de elaboración de informes especiales sobre Energías Renovables, Impactos y Adaptación, Cambio Climático y Desastres y Deforestación Evitada.

- Así mismo, resaltamos que aunque el IPCC ha realizado una importante labor en establecer las causas y los orígenes del cambio climático, consideramos que parte de éste esfuerzo debería de estar dedicado a identificar medidas de respuesta, en la medida que existe muy poca información sobre como enfrentar el cambio climático.

- Mantener la propuesta de la elaboración de un informe de Síntesis especialmente enfocado para los tomadores de decisiones.

3- Con respecto a la composición y estructura de la Junta se sugiere aceptar la propuesta actual de composición y número de miembros de la Junta, el igual que la propuesta de los dos Vice-Presidentes con tareas específicas y con amplia experiencia en temas económicos para que manejen los Grupos de Trabajo del Panel.

4. Considerando la importancia que ha adquirido el Panel y las nuevas tareas y retos que enfrenta en el futuro, será de gran importancia, como lo sugiere el Presidente del Panel, incrementar la capacidad técnica y financiera de la Secretaría del Panel, por lo que se deberá evaluar el aumento de apoyo técnico de alto nivel y una mayor fuente de recursos para la elaboración de investigaciones en los distintos temas.

5. En nuestra opinión, el IPCC debe fortalecer su capacidad de llegar a un mayor número de personas. La prensa ha mostrado ser un elemento crucial para informar al público sobre el cambio climático. No obstante lo anterior, se lleguen a los tomadores de decisiones de una manera más completa.

Así mismo, es importante resaltar que el Reporte de Síntesis del IPCC requiere de un análisis profundo, lo cual implica que una simple lectura del documento no es suficiente. Por lo tanto, sugerimos que se cree un espacio de interacción para los tomadores de decisiones, con el objetivo de difundir y explicar los alcances del reporte.

Al respecto, proponemos la creación de una estrategia liderada por el IPCC para promover una mayor difusión del reporte, y consideramos que el grupo de comunicaciones del IPCC debería ser fortalecido.

---

## The Netherlands - KNMI

A disturbing error has been pointed out in the first paragraph of our submission on the future of IPCC. I send you a corrected version. If it is not too late please switch this with the earlier one.

### **Future of IPCC, contribution of the Netherlands**

The Netherlands welcomes the opportunity to present suggestions regarding future IPCC organisation, procedures and products. We believe IPCC has an excellent record thanks to many thousands of scientists that have devoted a substantial amount of effort to contribute to the assessments. We may present quite a list of suggestions in this response to the chair's discussion paper, but that does not imply we do not have a very high regard for the conduct of the IPCC. We support the chair's analysis that IPCC should stick to its mandate. Each assessment cycle has brought something new to this historic institution. But progress for the sake of progress must be discouraged. Let us preserve what must be preserved and prune practices that ought to be prohibited.

### **Main suggestions of the Netherlands**

#### **1. Evaluate the IPCC secretariat, Bureau and TSUs**

The IPCC Bureau, Secretariat and TSUs together drive the IPCC process. The fact that the Secretariat and TSUs are small in size is an important asset to IPCC (low cost, flexible, little bureaucracy), although the workload seems to keep increasing over the years. However, before deciding on the optimal size of these facilitative structures, we recommend an objective and independent evaluation of the work of the Secretariat, the Bureau and the TSUs during the last assessment cycle. Periodic evaluation is in our opinion crucial for learning from past experiences, and for improving the already outstanding quality of IPCC products.

#### **2. Alternate assessment cycles for SRs and comprehensive assessments**

The scientific community needs a fair amount of time to develop and apply a new generation of scenarios, global Earth System Modelling (ESM), and impacts, adaptation and vulnerability modelling (IAV), integrated assessment modelling (IAM) and modelling of the feedbacks between these three areas. This process, from the definitions of emission scenarios until the assessment of climate change projections, impacts, adaptation and mitigation by IPCC, took about 10 years. The duration of this process may be shortened to 7 or 8 years if the new approach that was suggested by the scientific community (see report of IPCC-26 Doc 8 on new scenarios) and at the Noordwijkerhout expert meeting on new scenarios in September 2008 (report will be available for IPCC-27) were followed. We believe that in order to give new insights, the next comprehensive assessment should make use of the results of research that is based on these new scenarios.

There is however also a need to expose public opinion to information about the seriousness of climate change more frequently. In addition, it is not feasible to expect Bureau members and TSUs to commit themselves personally for such a prolonged period.

Therefore, we suggest first having an assessment cycle for compilation of reports on selected topics, followed by an assessment cycle that includes a comprehensive assessment. Both cycles should be decided on simultaneously, but a new bureau should be elected in between the two cycles and decisions may be taken on additional products.

Since climate change has been accepted as a serious and urgent global threat, policy makers will increasingly need information about regional climate change and its impacts, as well as about implementation of mitigation and adaptation measures. More Special Reports could best meet this need. When new policy needs are identified the demand for scientific assessment may not allow for the full assessment procedure that applies to Special Reports and comprehensive assessments. We would like to discuss with other Parties how the production time for some IPCC reports could be shortened (e.g. within one year), for example by allowing Technical Papers to contain new material.

#### **3. Intensify the involvement of stakeholders**

Now that climate change policy is moving from the phase of agenda setting to that of implementation, the involvement of stakeholders such as the private sector and NGOs should be greatly intensified. It no longer suffices to make reports relevant only for governments.

They should also be relevant for these stakeholders as the implementation of measures relies on them. Stakeholders also have a wealth of valuable practical experiences that is not well represented in peer-reviewed scientific literature but is essential for developing adequate policies. The panel may wish to consider inviting stakeholder representatives to scoping meetings.

#### **4. Create the best conditions for the synthesis of knowledge early on in the assessment**

The Netherlands stresses the importance of planning the Synthesis Report from the very beginning of the regular assessments process.

## **5. Improve the review process**

The reviewing process is a key phase in the IPCC assessments. In order to further improve objectivity, transparency, and quality we suggest the following:

- Make the expert reviews (not the government reviews) anonymous, in order to guarantee a more objective judgement of the review comments. This practice was tested with the Special report on CCS and worked well.
- Make the responses to review comments public shortly after a Lead Author meeting (and not after completion of the report, as is the current practice). This will enhance the transparency of the process.
- Since in many cases chapter teams have to consider many thousands of comments at Lead Author meetings, we suggest increasing the number of review editors from 2 to 4. In addition, we suggest offering the review editors specific training for this specialized work. This would improve the quality of the review process.

## **6. Plan and budget outreach activities in a timely fashion**

Outreach of IPCC reports is not only a task for the Secretariat but also for the WG co-chairs and TSUs. As this comes at the end of the assessment period, it is important to budget and plan these activities in a timely fashion. We believe that IPCC should limit its outreach activities to its own reports and not develop derived products for specific user groups. This task should be undertaken by other UN-bodies (WMO, UNEP, UNESCO, UNDP,...).

## **7. Do not focus IPCC's efforts on capacity building**

Specialised UN-bodies such as WMO, UNEP, UNESCO, UNDP and some of their activities (such as the research programmes) are much better positioned than the IPCC to build research capacity in developing countries. The IPCC should limit itself to inviting these bodies to fill the needs that are exposed as a result of IPCC's assessments.

### **Additional suggestions from the Netherlands**

The Netherlands' delegation has some additional suggestions in response to Dr. Pachauri's discussion paper.

- In order to properly and timely address cross-cutting issues between the working groups, a process should be started directly after the formation of a new Bureau, with inclusion of the lessons learned from the less successful TAR and AR4 experiences. Early interaction and integration between the Working Groups is essential for achieving a real synthesis of the outcomes of the AR5. However, we do not agree with Dr Pachauri's criticism that for instance the issue of sustainable development, or the Stern Review has not been adequately dealt with in the AR4. We don't think that a specific task group on the economics of climate change is needed, or that specific responsibilities with regard to economics need to be assigned to vice chairs. The scoping of the new assessment reports and the selection of authors should ensure that the economic issues would be adequately dealt with in the 5<sup>th</sup> assessment report and the respective special reports.
- Make the author selection criteria more explicit (e.g.: specific expertise in a certain areas, geographical balance, balance in views, balance between experienced and new people, and balance in gender).
- Address the geographical imbalance of the author community. There is a clear 'western dominance', which should be reduced. (e.g. there should be ways to finance TSUs and CLAs independently).
- Reduce the working load for CLAs by, expanding chapter teams with 'chapter assistants' or 'chapter secretaries'. The Nobel Prize money could be used to finance young scientists from developing countries to join as chapter assistants, which would help them to get international experience.
- Improve on the attendance of authors at meetings by reducing travelling barriers e.g. by allowing the secretariat to arrange the travelling and visa documents.
- Intensify the dialogue with the global change research programmes WCRP, IGBP, IHDP, Diversitas and the ESSP, e.g. by giving them full observer status.

---

## **Russian Federation (translation into English below)**

### **RUSSIAN FEDERATION FEDERAL SERVICE FOR HYDROMETEOROLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING**

Пользуясь случаем, Российская Федерация отмечает, что присуждение в 2007 году МГЭИК Нобелевской премии мира – знак выражения признательности МГЭИК за ее вклад в распространение более широких знаний о причинах изменения климата, а также выработку возможных мер борьбы с такими изменениями.

Российская Федерация считает возможным использовать подготовленный МГЭИК концептуальный документ «Будущее МГЭИК» в качестве основы для дальнейшей консолидации усилий международного научного сообщества в анализе и оценке происходящих и прогнозируемых изменений климата на основе доступной и проверяемой научно-технической и социально-экономической информации. В этой связи считаем, что по некоторым конкретным вопросам, по будущему МГЭИК, необходимо принять во внимание следующие соображения.

1. Представляется целесообразным сохранить установившуюся периодичность подготовки Оценочных докладов МГЭИК в 5-6 лет, а также схемы подготовки специализированных отчетов через три года после начала работы над оценочным докладом. Следует сохранить и усилить внимание к выполнению обязательной процедуры одобрения всеми правительствами Резюме для политиков, так как только оно должно приниматься во внимание в международном переговорном процессе. Установившаяся практика объединенного представления Оценочных докладов МГЭИК нуждается в

Пользуясь случаем, Российская Федерация отмечает, что присуждение в 2007 году МГЭИК Нобелевской премии мира – знак выражения признательности МГЭИК за ее вклад в распространение более широких знаний о причинах изменения климата, а также выработку возможных мер борьбы с такими изменениями.

Российская Федерация считает возможным использовать подготовленный МГЭИК концептуальный документ «Будущее МГЭИК» в качестве основы для дальнейшей консолидации усилий международного научного сообщества в анализе и оценке происходящих и прогнозируемых изменений климата на основе доступной и проверяемой научно-технической и социально-экономической информации. В этой связи считаем, что по некоторым конкретным вопросам, по будущему МГЭИК, необходимо принять во внимание следующие соображения.

1. Представляется целесообразным сохранить установившуюся периодичность подготовки Оценочных докладов МГЭИК в 5-6 лет, а также схемы подготовки специализированных отчетов через три года после начала работы над оценочным докладом. Следует сохранить и усилить внимание к выполнению обязательной процедуры одобрения всеми правительствами Резюме для политиков, так как только оно должно приниматься во внимание в международном переговорном процессе. Установившаяся практика объединенного представления Оценочных докладов МГЭИК нуждается в

пересмотре, так как каждый из материалов МГЭИК имеет вполне определенный самостоятельный статус, предназначенный для различного использования. В этой связи считаем, что взамен установившейся практики должна быть разработана соответствующая официальная процедура МГЭИК.

2. В концептуальном документе справедливо отмечено, что региональные исследования изменений климата ограничены в местах, где наблюдательные сети недостаточно развиты (развивающиеся страны, труднодоступные регионы). В этой связи, надеемся, что МГЭИК уделит соответствующее внимание использованию потенциала Национальных метеорологических и гидрологических служб (НМГС) в области мониторинга, региональных оценок климата и подготовки стратегий адаптации при координации ВМО. ВМО необходимо давать рекомендации МГЭИК относительно научно-исследовательских планов и идей в отношении проведения будущих оценок МГЭИК. В связи с этим Секретариат МГЭИК должен уделить соответствующее внимание расширению использования потенциала НМГС в области мониторинга, региональных оценок климата и подготовки стратегий адаптации. Представляется обоснованным проработать предложение и подготовить специализированный отчет МГЭИК по этим аспектам.

3. МГЭИК следует соблюдать свой статус авторитетного научного органа и избегать любых политических или экономических оценок, которые должны оставаться прерогативой Сторон РКИК ООН. Проблему расширения экономических исследований предлагаем обсудить с другими заинтересованными международными организациями, компетентными в вопросах экономики изменений климата. МГЭИК должна повышать авторитетность своих работ, путем обобщения и учета мнения не только отдельных ученых, но и ведущих научных школ и национальных академий наук. Доклады МГЭИК должны быть обоснованными и сугубо научными.

4. Процедуры МГЭИК должны быть четко определенными, надлежащим образом соответствующими статусу межправительственного органа, особенно в части отбора и назначения экспертов. Мы разделяем озабоченность секретариата в отношении возникающих проблем участия представителей развивающихся стран и стран с переходной экономикой в мероприятиях МГЭИК, исходим из необходимости постоянного улучшения организационных и административных процедур. При этом особое внимание следует уделить обеспечению традиционного высокого интеллектуального уровня авторов и широкому представительству указанных стран в работе МГЭИК. Однако при этом, необходимо сохранение базовых исходных подходов формирования сбалансированного представительства стран в Бюро МГЭИК без нарушений справедливого географического представительства.

5. Обоснование, приводимое в качестве аргумента сокращения должности одного вице-председателя МГЭИК, на нынешнем этапе представляется недостаточным. Более логичным выглядит увязка вопросов, курируемых вице-председателями МГЭИК с направлениями работ рабочих групп: три вице-председателя – три рабочие группы.

6. В рамках предпринимаемого обновления действующих механизмов МГЭИК представлялось бы целесообразным обеспечить возможность отрегулировать все процедуры их действия таким образом, чтобы свои функции в МГЭИК осуществляли высоко профессиональные лица, которых номинировали соответствующие правительства участвующих стран-членов. Правительствам необходимо рекомендовать осуществлять отбор экспертов из НГМС.

В заключении хотел бы заверить Вас в продолжении активной поддержки работы МГЭИК со стороны Российской Федерации и нашем намерении активно участвовать в обсуждении будущего МГЭИК на 28-ой сессии МГЭИК в Будапеште (апрель, 2008г.).

---

## Spain

### General Comments:

We thank IPCC Chair for launching this consultation process giving us the opportunity to provide comments on the future of the IPCC. We consider the document entitled "Some issues related to the future of the IPCC" an excellent and interesting paper for starting the discussion. In general terms, we share the views and recommendation contained on it.

Spain has always strongly supported the IPCC activities and the assessment reports produced. We recognise the great work that has been done by the IPCC along these 20 years where its Assessment Reports, Special Reports and other documents has been crucial not only for compiling the latest knowledge about climate change for countries and public opinion but as a cornerstone that has been supporting all the work done in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In our view the AR4 has to play a crucial role as a scientific reference during the deliberations on the future climate regime (post-2012).

The IPCC has obtained a recognized reputation for the comprehensive work done in its reports based on peer reviewed literature and approved by policymakers, which has given to these scientific, technical and socio economic assessments a unique validity and credibility. Results of this recognition are the latest Decision of the UNFCCC, that express and recognise the importance of the IPCC, and the Nobel Peace Prize, for the efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-induced climate change, and to provide the basis for the measures that are needed to counteract such change.

Spain considers that there is not a need to make significant changes, only some limited and refinement changes should be done in order to improve the operation and fill possible minor gaps of the IPCC activities. The comprehensive assessments should remain as the principal output and main activity of the IPCC.

The key issue of our view is to keep the current periodicity of the IPCC Assessment Reports. Therefore, we strongly support to keep the current system to produce a comprehensive an Assessment Report in a five to six year cycle. We could not support the option to have cycles of 10-12 years, even including that Special Reports could be published at irregular basis in the mean time. In our view a cycle of 10-12 years would be very long, losing very significant and relevant information for both the policy makers and the general public.

### Specific comments

#### 1. Comprehensive Reports

The assessment reports will focus in the identification of gaps in knowledge and data in a more concrete way, after each report or in a regular basis, in order to give inputs to the scientific community, the international research and observational programmes and countries where those gaps are.

The Fifth Assessment Report should be launched before the end 2008 or early 2009. It should contain the three parts from the contribution of the Three Working Groups plus the Synthesis Report. We consider also important to produce, during the first part of the cycle, a limited number of Special Reports on specific subjects, as it is proposed by the IPCC Chair.

As to tackle climate change will progressively require to policy makers to have an integrated and global vision of the problem, the future assessments cycles should ensure a better inter-linkage and coordination between the three Working Groups.

Spain also considers that future assessment report should be more focus in the policy makers needs related to the fundamental issues of sustainable development covering all regions of the world with the same approaches. We will need to be more precise in finding and defining ways to combine economic development of poor areas (not just countries), and economical growth with limiting emission of CO<sub>2</sub>.

At present, the adaptation and mitigation are topics of paramount importance for all governments. While adaptation is an important issue for all countries, in the case of developing country is crucial. Unfortunately, there is a significant lack of knowledge and literature on adaptation process, therefore big efforts will be needed in assessing and identifying, issues such as, best practices to implement adaptation measures and feasible ways to induce sustainable production for several, different productive sectors. All these issues should be specifically considered for different countries, taking into account their differences in climate, natural resources, economy and policies.

Therefore, the regional aspects of climate changes will be an area where substantial work will be needed. We need to extract as much as possible from the current information available in the AR4 as well as from other sources. On one hand, in the Fifth Assessment Report we will need to devote important efforts in order to get the most valuable, consistent and coherent regional assessment from the three WGs. Maybe we will need to revise the current concept of geographical region introducing, different sub-regions and new special climatic regions, which have relevant particularities, i.e Mediterranean region. On the other hand, we are aware of that IPCC by itself cannot address all issues in this field, so we support the IPCC Chair proposal described in paragraph 3.2.

There will also be an increasing and strong demand to know more about the economical dimension of climate change, both adaptation and mitigation, Therefore the future assessments should focus more on socioeconomic and economic aspects, i.e cost of inaction, cost-efficiency analyses of mitigation and adaptation measures, and effectiveness of different policies. The information will come especially for Working Group II and III. In this regards, we support the Chair's proposal to create a small group to made an assessment of the WG Reports of the AR4 and to identify what and where we will need to act.

In this context, the development of global and regional new emission scenarios is crucial. They should be ready before the next Assessment Report and should be updated for improving the work done by the IPCC. In our view, the Fifth Assessment Report will be built on the new emissions scenarios, currently under development, in order to get the maximum added value in relation to AR4.

## **2. Synthesis Report**

The Synthesis Report (SyR) is the piece of information more useful for the policy makers. We propose to give greater priority to its planning and elaboration, defining its structure and scope at the beginning of the cycle. The SyR should contain policy relevant information (not political prescriptive), providing an integrated vision of the key scientific findings and other relevant aspects to tackle climate change. The AR4 Synthesis Report is based more in a compilation of the SPMs that in a really synthesis and integrated vision of the information. It is crucial to improve this issue in the next cycle. In addition, although the length of the Synthesis Report should be limited, the number of pages should not be the only guideline. The number of 30 pages seems reasonable.

## **3. Special Reports**

The Special Reports are very valuable to the Policy Makers. The IPCC should continue with the development of special reports as support of the main work presented by the assessment reports. It would be very helpful to make some reports focusing on topics or regions that are useful to Parties, especially to developing countries.

The Special Reports should satisfy specific needs on recent or crucial scientific knowledge expressed by Parties and in particular by the UNFCCC. They could be also beneficial to make regular reports with key indicators that could be updated between the assessment report periods. Nevertheless, Special Reports should be concentrated in subjects that could provide a considerable added value.

Regarding the proposal made by the IPCC Chair, we strongly support the completion of a Special Report on renewables as soon as possible and well before the closure of the Working Group III Report of the AR5. We really hope to reach a decision on this direction during the next IPCC in Budapest. We also support as other potential issues those dealing with climate change and disasters, impacts and adaptation, the economy of climate change, etc. In our opinion, it would be worthy to have an early decision on the main issues to be covered by Special Reports during the Fifth Assessment Cycle, so enough time should be devoted for deliberation on this, during next IPCC Plenaries.

## **4. Organisational issues:**

Spain considers that the organizational structure has proven a successful functioning and not significant changes are needed, only some refinements for improving it. In our view, the present size of the bureau is appropriated and it should not be increased. Although we have not a strong view about the number of IPCC Vice- Chairs, we think that to reduce to two the IPCC Vice-chairs, in principle, could give advantages for focusing specific responsibilities and tasks and coordination issues, but a more detailed analysis is needed.

Taking into account the increasing of tasks and coordination activities it is important to give to the IPCC Secretariat the adequate capacity to ensure all the future work. In this regard, we support the proposal to strengthen the IPCC Secretariat staff with one more professional with a scientific background. In addition, to the scientific and technical background, experience on advising policy makers and criteria on geographical balance should also be taken into account in the selection of the new professional.

Other issues that could improve the objectivity of the IPCC and will allow to take maximum use of IPCC products are those related to:

- Establish concrete criteria for selecting authors for the reports, reinforcing the role of the review editors and balancing the number of authors by country or region, among others.
- Keep the geographical balance and promote the rotation of members in the IPCC Bureau and Working Groups.
- Consider in more extension the scientific literature published in other languages than English.
- Promote the UN official languages in the IPCC material and events, i.e, graphics, figures, speeches, presentations, publications.

Further proposed reviews on procedures, duties of the members as well as expenditures and travel arrangements, are welcome.

---

## **Bureau member comments**

### **RESPONSE FROM WORKING GROUP II TO CHAIR'S PAPER ON FUTURE OF THE IPCC**

**MARTIN PARRY, OSVALDO CANZIANI, JEAN PALUTIKOF**

1. The same three Working Groups should remain in place, with broadly the same remits, for the next assessment.
2. It is clear that research in the field of WGII will continue to accelerate, and that a strong assessment of this field within the next 5-7 years will be important. We wish to stress that this should cover impact assessment and adaptation in an integrated manner.
3. While the occasional special report may be useful in targeting a particular issue, it is important that a comprehensive assessment of knowledge is undertaken. There is otherwise the risk that an array of special reports would leave significant areas of knowledge under-assessed. SRs should be used extremely sparingly since they are demanding of WG and author time.
4. There are four areas where especial emphasis in WGII will be needed: a) on adaptive capacity and limits b) on regional impacts c) on costs (both of impacts and adaptation) and (d) impacts of 'high-end' climate change (global temperature increases >4°C).
5. There is a need for stronger links between the three WG reports. This requires a careful overview of their plenary agreed outlines to avoid significant gaps between the WG assessment (such as gaps which occurred in the AR4). This should be the responsibility of the Chair.
6. Closer liaison between the WGs is necessary in the following areas to ensure the fullest assessment of such issues: regional climate prediction; relations between adaptation-mitigation (especially costs); implications for sustainable development; impacts of climate change under stabilisation/mitigation. We believe that this is the best way to ensure assessment of such issues, rather than special reports.

7. Early identification of key questions for assessments, and embodiment of these in WG outlines at a much earlier stage than at present, is necessary so that more complete answers to these key questions can be incorporated in the SYR.

8. We recommend that future assessments need not be published in printed volumes, but that these be published in web form (with hard copy SPM and TS).

9. The whole IPCC organisation should be put on a more professional footing, especially in terms of coordination and communication i) between Chair, Secretariat, WGs, Bureau and Plenary, and ii) with other UN and international bodies. This would **not** necessarily need more funding.

---

## **John W Zillman - Former IPCC Bureau member**

It is well past the deadline but, for what they are worth, here are my summary views on the future of the IPCC:

(a) The preparation of a comprehensive Assessment Report every five to seven years should be continued for the science and impacts. The need for an up-to-date overview of current knowledge of the science will continue irrespective of the preparation of Special Reports on topics and issues of particular relevance at the time. The Working Group mechanism should be retained for the comprehensive assessment component of the report.

(b) Special topics in the science as well as the adaptation and mitigation issues are, in my view, more suited for a "task-and-finish" Task Force mechanism and the preparation of Special Reports. The issues chosen should be mainly based on the needs of the IPCC sponsors and the UNFCCC.

(c) The regular Synthesis Report should probably be maintained to draw together a user friendly version of the latest science and the key policy relevant adaptation and mitigation issues from the Special Reports completed in the previous five to seven years.

(d) The present Inventories Task Force should be moved across to an appropriate institutional framework in the research community or, at least in part, to the Convention bodies. The IPCC should be a purely an assessment body.

(e) The perception that the IPCC is increasingly a promotional vehicle for climate researchers needs to be countered by putting greater emphasis on recruiting AR5 Lead Authors who are not the authors of the bulk of the literature being assessed.

(f) The core group of the Bureau for the AR5 should be composed of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairs and the Working Group and/or Task Force Co-Chairs, in that order of perceived seniority in the IPCC community.

(g) If the AR5 remains primarily focused on global issues, there should be a Chairman and First and Second Vice-Chairmen, all three of whom should be "stateless" but elected as a "balanced team" without hard and fast adherence to regional, discipline or developing/developed country background. The Working Group Vice-Chairs, in this case, should continue to be regionally representative.

(h) If, however, the IPCC and AR5 move strongly to a focus on regional issues, it would be better to have a single "stateless" Chairman and six Vice-Chairs, one for each region, who would really drive the assessment process for their individual regions. In this case the Task Force mechanism, with each Task Force led by an IPCC Vice-Chair, would seem more appropriate than a Working Group structure for the regional assessments.

---

***\*\* End of late comments\*\****

## Translations into English of earlier submissions

### **Colombia - Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

1. Colombia considers it necessary to strengthen the IPCC with regard to the local and regional impact of climate change, especially in those regions where no research on that impact has been carried out. Accordingly, we support the proposal that the IPCC act as a facilitator in establishing a Working Group of Experts, from which might emerge an action plan for strengthening research into climate change on both regional and local levels.

2. Colombia supports the production of the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), provided that the following suggestions are incorporated:

- Special reports are produced at appropriate times so that all the information can be collected (in accordance with the document, we suggest that this be every 3 years);
- Regarding the production of comprehensive assessments: as suggested, only every two cycles (every 10 to 12 years) would be too long to be able to take specific actions for the different areas covered. Accordingly, it is important to support the Chair of the IPCC's proposal that comprehensive assessments be carried out following the present time-scale (every 5 to 6 years) but special reports over 3 years, in accordance with the Board's mandate;
- Likewise, Colombia believes that it is particularly important to produce a comprehensive assessment for 2012 to aid in negotiations during the post-2012 period of compliance with the Kyoto Protocol. This report must be planned in such a way that the current subjects of the international negotiation agenda are dealt with specifically;
- We support the production of special reports on renewable energy technologies; climate change and disasters, impact and adaptation; and the avoidance of deforestation;
- Likewise we emphasize that, although the IPCC has carried out an important task in establishing the causes and origins of climate change, we believe that part of this effort should be dedicated to identifying response measures, given that there is very little existing information about how to tackle climate change;
- We support the proposal to produce a Synthesis Report specifically aimed at policymakers.

3. Regarding the composition and structure of the Board, we suggest accepting the present proposal for the Board's composition and number of members, as well as the proposal to have two Vice-Chairs with specific tasks and substantial expertise on economic issues to lead the IPCC's Working Groups.

4. Considering how important the IPCC has become, and the new tasks and challenges which it faces in the future, increasing the Secretariat's technical and financial capacity will, as the Chair suggests, be very important; therefore we must assess the increase in high-level technical support and a larger pool of resources for conducting research in different areas.

5. In our opinion, the IPCC must strengthen its capacity to reach a greater number of people. The press has shown itself to be a crucial element in informing the public about climate change. However, it is to be hoped that information reaches policymakers in a more complete way.

Likewise, it is important to emphasize that the IPCC's Synthesis Report requires in-depth analysis, which means that simply reading the document is not enough. Therefore, we suggest that a forum for policymakers be set up, with the aim of disseminating and explaining the report's achievements.

Accordingly, we propose the creation of a strategy headed by the IPCC to promote the report's wider dissemination, and we believe that the IPCC's Communications Group should be strengthened.

---

## **Dominican Republic - Environment and Natural Resources**

### **1. A review of the past**

No comments

### **2. Do we need any change?**

2.1 The Dominican Republic endorses and supports the IPCC's openness to change based on the three points cited from this section, especially that of continued and strengthened public access to the IPCC's studies.

2.2 & 2.3 It endorses and supports the review's execution and inclusion on the agenda of IPCC-XXVIII in Budapest, so that new points of view regarding the problem, which have been gaining prominence in the last few years, can be reviewed, and the soundness of current principles can be proved. The Dominican Republic is available to help with this, and would like to continue participating as part of this Working Group.

2.4 It supports the idea of continuing the three groups already established.

2.5 & 2.6 No comments

### **3. Drivers of required change in the future**

3.1 We agree that there is a high level and quality of public awareness about climate change and its scientific basis. However, the Dominican Republic notices and understands that there is a need for more work on economic matters and sustainable development, as they have not been dealt with adequately or with the attention that they deserve.

3.2 We endorse and support the consequence that we must dedicate ourselves to working on the economic aspects of climate change. The economic dimension must be included in future evaluations. We also support the initiative to form an assessment group, to be decided at IPCC-XXVIII. Additionally, we support the idea of holding regional workshops to deal with each individual region's problems relating to climate change.

### **4. Future output of the IPCC**

The Dominican Republic favours and supports: continuing with the three Working Group Reports, and continuing with the current system of one comprehensive assessment every 5-6 years, but with special reports on specific subjects to be carried out early in the first three years of the 5-6 year period.

We also endorse and support the proposed reports on: renewable energy technologies; climate change and disasters, impact and adaptation; climate change and soil quality; climate change and water; and sustainable development and climate change, among others. We are equally in favour of the production of a Synthesis Report on policies with a 30-page limit and aimed at policymakers.

### **5. Organizational issues related to the functioning of the next Bureau**

The Dominican Republic favours and supports the proposed changes, as it considers them reasonable. Obviously, the next meeting (XXVIII) will be an opportunity to discuss the proposed changes to the way the Bureau operates in more depth.

### **6. Next steps**

No comments

---

## **France - Ministry of Ecology, and Sustainable Development and Planning**

### **1. A review of the past**

The IPCC's structure, procedures and work methods have, as you point out, proved their effectiveness. However, we emphasize the essential role of each **Working Group's Bureau as a liaison between the politicians who chose them and the scientists of which they are composed**. They choose the Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs) and the Lead Authors (LAs), as well as supervising the various chapters' coherence and the application of suggestions during the review stage. The Chairs of the working groups preside over the plenary meetings about approving the reports and call on the coordinators to discuss the politicians' proposed amendments.

The most difficult discussions at these meetings arise when certain delegations oppose, for political reasons, the scientists' views. From this point of view, the phrase: "*It is relevant to observe that the requirements of consensus have been met to a surprising extent, even though there is provision in the principles for recording differences of views*" could equally be written: "*It is relevant to observe that the requirements of consensus have been met to a surprising extent, **because there is provision in the principles for recording differences of views***". **For us, the rule quoted in the footnote is essential for achieving consensus, as it is a deterrent: the credibility of any country whose contradiction of an undeniable scientific truth that was duly recorded in an IPCC report would be undermined. In our opinion, retaining this rule and not hesitating to use it when justified are essential to avoid further increase of political considerations in the plenary meetings' judgements.**

We are not convinced that extra efforts in the IPCC's outreach activities are necessary. The whole world is waiting for the reports; making all the texts and slides available in every language would be far more useful. Effort must be made to translate them quickly and to a high standard, as well as widely disseminating paper copies of the reports.

## 2. Do we need any changes?

**We believe that the IPCC should reiterate the main areas where particular research efforts are needed to facilitate political decision-making.** Such a list would be useful for motivating researchers and in assigning credits taken by governments. The following subjects seem particularly significant to us:

### Group 1

- Climate change's sensitivity to atmospheric composition (with the aim of reducing present uncertainty by a factor of 3);
- Dynamics of high-latitude ice-sheets;
- Influence of CO<sub>2</sub> absorbed into the atmosphere, and the resulting positive feedback loop, on climate change;
- Simulations of future regional climates.

### Group 2

- Influence of development on adaptive capacity;
- Estimation of the economic costs of damage and adaptation;
- Analysis of regional impacts.

### Group 3

- Scientific and technical constraints on the various conceivable solutions for producing electricity without emitting greenhouse gases, storing this energy or conserving energy;
- Effectiveness of organizing activities relating to greenhouse gases: dematerialization of the economy and development of possibilities of telecommuting, possibilities of evening out electrical consumption by cutting power selectively depending on momentary demand.

2.3 The IPCC's Website mentions that the principles for work were amended in April 2006 in Mauritius. Therefore, there is no statutory obligation to deal with this matter before 2006, as the present situation seems satisfactory to us.

2.4 We support this distribution amongst the groups, which must be retained. In practice however, we propose asking the corresponding Bureaus to increase their efforts in the economic work of Working Group II and the technical work of Working Group III. Also, the scientists who we consulted whilst writing the Assessment Report felt that they were under-informed about the other groups' progress. It might be useful to organize information presentations by representatives of other working groups during the writing groups' important meetings.

## 3. Drivers of required changes in the future

In general, we agree with the chapter's content. However, the IPCC cannot report on studies which are not published in peer-review journals; it would therefore be useful, with the aim of encouraging studies on insufficiently covered subjects, to draw up a list of subjects particularly relevant to the political decisions about which it is to be hoped that special research efforts will be made, as we proposed above.

## 4. Future outputs of the IPCC

4.1.2 We are convinced that the IPCC's influence would be considerably diminished if it stopped publishing its Assessment Report every 5 or 6 years. We therefore strongly support maintaining this timetable, which is the best compromise between the public's information needs, the availability of new information, and the natural cycle of climate negotiations.

4.1.3 A limited number of special reports must be carried out according to Member States' requests. However, we estimate that good conditions for writing these are impossible if coordinating them is left to one of the working groups. We do not think that a Vice-Chair of the IPCC, who would not be surrounded by a strong scientific team, could cope with such a task (see 5.1.2). We also believe that the next plenary meeting should examine all the requests for special reports made between now and then, in order to best plan future work.

4.1.4 The usefulness of technical papers is questionable, since the way they are prepared and adopted limits their authority, while they require the scientists to do extra work that is similar to the special reports.

4.1.5 We agree entirely with your ideas for the Synthesis Report.

## 5. Organizational issues related to the functioning of the next Bureau

5.1.1 The inclusion of a specialist economist in the Bureaus of Groups II and III seems sensible to us. However, as Group III already has one it needs a technology specialist as well.

5.1.2 We are not convinced that reducing the number of Vice-Chairs from 3 to 2 is necessary, given the increased demand for information faced by the IPCC. Responsibilities must, however, be clearly defined, particularly so as to avoid the duties of the Co-Chairs of the Working Groups being complicated by new tasks. The Vice-Chairs of the IPCC and of the Working Groups must above all represent the IPCC and maintain the necessary distance from their government. To this end, it would be better if during plenary sessions the Vice-Chairs of the IPCC sat at the head table or in places reserved in the front row of the assembly.

5.3 We are not in favour of strengthening the secretariat using scientific personnel, which risks complicating the task of the Working Groups' technical support units.

5.1.4 and 5.1.5 These two points need to be more explicit; we are unable to support these propositions without additional details.

## 6. Next steps

In our view, the essential point is continuing with the current timetable for the Assessment Reports.

---

## **Russian Federation**

On this occasion, the Russian Federation wishes to note that the awarding in 2007 of the Nobel Peace Prize to the IPCC is an expression of gratitude to the IPCC for its contribution towards disseminating more extensive knowledge on the causes of climate change and developing possible mitigation measures.

The Russian Federation considers it possible to use the IPCC's discussion document on the future of the IPCC as a basis for further consolidation of efforts by the international scientific community to analyse and assess past and anticipated climate change based on available verified scientific, technical and socio-economic information. In this connection, we think that, on certain issues, the following should be taken into account:

1. It seems preferable to keep the 5-6 year IPCC assessment report cycle with special reports on specific subjects carried out within three years of the start of work on the assessment reports.

Attention should continue to be given and even increased to fulfilling the mandatory procedures for approval of the summary for policymakers by all governments, as only this has to be taken into account in the international negotiation process. The established practice of submitting unified IPCC assessment reports needs to be reviewed as each of the individual IPCC reports has fully independent status being intended for different use. We think that instead of the established practice an appropriate official IPCC procedure should be developed.

2. The discussion document rightly points out that regional research into climate change is limited in places where the observing networks are insufficiently developed (developing countries and remote regions). We hope that the IPCC will devote due attention to the use of the potential of National Meteorological and Hydrological Services (NMHSs) in the field of monitoring, regional climate assessments and preparation of adaptation strategies, with coordination by WMO. WMO has to give recommendations to the IPCC regarding research plans and ideas for future IPCC assessments. The IPCC Secretariat must therefore give due attention to enhancing the use of the potential of NMHSs in the field of monitoring, regional climate assessments and preparation of adaptation strategies. It seems justifiable to develop a proposal and prepare a special IPCC report on these aspects.

3. The IPCC should adhere to its status as an authoritative scientific organ and avoid any political or economic assessments, which should remain the prerogative of the Parties to the UNFCCC. We propose discussing the

expansion of economic research with other interested international organizations that are competent in matters related to the economics of climate change.

4. IPCC procedures should be clearly determined in a manner fitting its status as an intergovernmental organ, particularly as regards the selection and nomination of experts. We share the Secretariat's concern about problems arising for participation in IPCC meetings of representatives of developing countries and countries with transitional economies, in view of the need for constant improvement in organizational and administrative procedures. Special attention should be given to ensuring the traditionally high intellectual level of authors and the wide representation of the above countries in the work of the IPCC. However, the fundamental, original approaches should be kept for forming a balanced representation of countries in the IPCC Bureau without disrupting equitable geographical representation.
5. The arguments put forward for cutting the post of one Vice-Chair of the IPCC, do not seem sufficient at this stage. It would seem more logical to relate the matters to be dealt with by the Vice-Chairs to the areas covered by the working groups, thus three vice-chairmen — three working groups.
6. Within the review of IPCC mechanisms under way, it would seem appropriate to ensure the possibility of regulating all procedures for their functioning so that the highly professional people nominated by the respective governments of participating Member countries may carry out their functions in the IPCC. It should be recommended that the governments select experts from the NMHSs.

In conclusion, I wish to assure you of continued active support for the work of the IPCC by the Russian Federation and our intention to take an active part in the discussion of the future of the IPCC at the 28<sup>th</sup> session in Budapest (April 2008).

---

## **Togo - Department of the Environment**

### **Items to be included on the IPCC's agenda for drawing up the Fifth Assessment Report**

1 – The IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report revealed that almost the whole of Latin America and Africa, with the exception of South Africa and the Maghreb, are pitifully lacking in basic observational data for making sustained analysis of the effects and impact of climate change on sustainable development, and for making more accurate predictions about the future of climate change in these regions.

This lack of reliable meteorological observations is due to the state of the observation instruments: completely obsolete or even nonexistent.

It should be pointed out that the IPCC includes among its present and future activities technical and even financial support through the WEF to improve the quality of meteorological observations and promote research which will, firstly, allow clarification of what the real prevailing climatic situation is in these regions and, secondly, permit these regions' populations to better integrate the struggle against climate change into their development strategies.

2 – The IPCC could make provision for translating the various reports from the English in which they are generally produced into the other official languages of the United Nations. It is worth noting that the very low-level use made of these reports, which are very rich in information, is due in most cases to a poor mastery of English, which in turn does not encourage the most efficient implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

3 – The IPCC has carried out scientific analyses based on climate observation data to convince the international community of the causes, effects and the present and future impact of climate change. Even if some countries, because of personal but illusory interests, still continue to pretend not to grasp and understand the IPCC's clear demonstrations, it is evident that climate change constitutes a threat to humanity and that urgent action must be taken by the international community as a whole in preparation for the climatic atrocities on various fronts predicted by the IPCC.

To that end, it should be pointed out that the IPCC is committed to drawing up adaptation and alleviation strategies and methodologies relating to all development sectors which will be used by the different populations according to which is best adapted to their environment.

---

**\*\* End of translations into English of earlier submissions \*\***